

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 16-34 are pending in this application. Claims 1-15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 16-34 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Applicants note that a number of editorial amendments have been made to the specification and abstract for grammatical and general readability purposes, and to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action. These amendments to the specification and abstract are incorporated in the attached substitute specification and abstract. Also enclosed is a marked-up copy of the original specification and abstract showing the changes incorporated into the substitute specification and abstract. The enclosure is captioned "**Version with markings to show changes made.**" No new matter has been added.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Figures. 24A and 24B should be designated as prior art. Accordingly, replacement drawing sheets are submitted herewith in order to label each of Figs. 24A and 24B as "Prior Art." Approval and entry of these replacement drawing sheets are respectfully requested.

Also, on page 2, the Examiner objected to the specification because reference character 201 was used to identify both the movable plate and the film feeder. Accordingly, new reference character 210 has been used to identify the film feeder in the substitute specification.

On page 3, the Examiner objected to original claim 1 due to an alleged misspelling in the term "clamping force-receiving portion." This objection is considered moot in view of the cancellation of original claim 1. However, Applicants note that each word of the term "clamping

force-receiving portion” is spelled correctly. Presumably, the Examiner intended to indicate that the hyphen is misplaced. Accordingly, Applicants have drafted the new claims to recite a “*clamping-force* receiving portion” instead of a “clamping *force-receiving* portion” in a bona fide attempt to avoid a similar objection to the new claims.

On pages 3-12, claims 1-9 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. (U.S. 5,753,275; hereinafter “Takahashi”) in view of Andras (U.S. 3,717,428). Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi and Andras in view of Atake (U.S. 5,851,558); and claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi and Andras in view of Larsson (U.S. 5,516,470). These rejections are considered moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1-15. Further, these rejections are believed to be clearly inapplicable to new claims 16-34 for at least the following reasons.

New independent claim 16 specifies that a first one of the mold members includes a clamping-force receiving portion shaped and arranged to allow the roll-type decorating film to pass entirely and continuously through the passing region between the mold members when the mold members are in a joined position. The clamping-force receiving portion is positioned around the mounting face of the dieset substantially symmetrical with respect to a center line of the first mold member along a passing direction of the decorating film, so as to be outside the passing region of the decorating film. Thus, claim 16 has been drafted to clarify that the mold of the present invention is structured to allow a roll-type decorating film to pass through the mold members when the mold members are joined. In particular, the shape and arrangement of the

clamping force receiving portion allows the decorating film to pass entirely and continuously through the mold members in the joined position. As a result of the claimed structure, the joined mold members do not exert a clamping force on the decorating film (Specification, p. 40, lines 10-14; p. 59, lines 10-14).

The Takahashi reference does not disclose or suggest providing a clamping-force receiving portion shaped and arranged to allow a roll-type decorating film to pass entirely and continuously through a passing region between mold members when the mold members are joined. Unlike the clamping-force receiving portion of the present invention, the alleged clamping-force receiving portion of Takahashi (as at 5 or 13) is a cylindrical ring (Col. 1, lines 43-47; 52-55) which would prevent a decorating film from passing entirely through the mold members when the mold members are in the joined position, as shown in Figure 5. In other words, members 5 and 13 of Takahashi are not shaped or arranged to allow a decorating film to be passed entirely through the joined mold members. There is no passing region for a decorating film when the mold members are joined. Consequently, the mold of Takahashi is unable to offer the same functionality or provide the aforementioned advantage of the present invention.

Andras has been cited merely for its teaching of an engagement mechanism for engaging a cavity-forming block, and does not disclose or suggest the aforementioned distinguishable feature lacking from Takahashi. Thus, the combination of Takahashi and Andras is likewise deficient.

Furthermore, the Atake and Larsson, which were cited for the features of original dependent claims 10, 11, and 12, also fail to disclose or suggest the above-identified

distinguishable feature of claim 16 lacking from the combination of Takahashi and Andras.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 16, as well as claims 17-34 which depend therefrom, are patentable over the references of record.

Finally, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to dependent claims 31-33 which further distinguish the present invention over the prior art. In particular, claim 31 specifies that the clamping-force receiving portion comprises a plurality of components evenly arranged around the cavity-forming block. Claim 32 specifically requires two components, and claim 33 requires four components.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Naoto TOYOOKA et al.

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm
Registration No. 44,142
Attorney for Applicants

KAM(WCP)/emj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 21, 2008